R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 011 135 EA 000 325

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF INCONSISTENT VOTER BEHAVIOR IN SCHOOL BUDGET ELECTIONS.

BY- SCHOONHOVEN, JOHN VAN PATTERSON, WADE N.
OREGON UNIV., EUGENE

REPORT NUMBER DSSC-VOL-10-NO-5 PUB DATE NOV 66
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$1.72 43P.

DESCRIPTORS- *VOTING, *SCHOOL BUDGET ELECTIONS, EDUCATIONAL EXPERIMENTS, *DEMOGRAPHY, AGE, OCCUPATIONS, INCOME, QUESTIONNAIRES, SPRINGFIELD, PORTLAND, EUGENE

QUESTIONNAIRES WERE SENT TO A 10 PERCENT SAMPLE OF INCONSISTENT VOTERS IN TWO OREGON PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS WHO HAD NOT VOTED IN A PREVIOUS, UNSUCCESSFUL SCHOOL BUDGET ELECTION, BUT WHO HAD VOTED IN A SUBSEQUENT SUCCESSFUL ELECTION. DESPITE DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE DISTRICTS IN LEVEL OF SCHOOLING COMPLETED, OCCUPATION, INCOME, PERIOD OF RESIDENCE, POLITICAL AFFILIATION, AND RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE, REASONS FOR VOTING POSITIONS WERE SIMILAR IN BOTH DISTRICTS. APPROXIMATELY THREE-FIFTHS OF THE VOTERS FELT THEIR SUPPORT WAS NEEDED OR RECOGNIZED THE VALUE OF EDUCATION. IN EACH DISTRICT ONE-FOURTH OF THE VOTERS ATTRIBUTED THEIR FAILURE TO VOTE TO FORGETTING OR TO BEING UNAWARE OF THE ELECTION. A MAJORITY IN BOTH DISTRICTS FELT THEY HAD A LEGITIMATE REASON FOR NOT VOTING PREVIOUSLY AND SEEMED DETERMINED TO UTILIZE THEIR VOTE TO AFFECT THE FINAL OUTCOME. STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES WERE NOTED IN BOTH DISTRICTS BETWEEN POSITIVE VOTING AND VOTERS WITH CHILDREN IN SCHOOL AND MORE COMPLETED YEARS OF SCHOOLING. SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS IN ONE DISTRICT (NOT SUPPORTED BY THE SECOND DISTRICT) RELATED POSITIVE VOTING TO (1) PERSONS UNDER 45 YEARS OF AGE, (2) LEVEL OF OCCUPATIONAL SKILL, (3) SPOUSES AS INCOME PRODUCERS, AND (4) FAMILY INCOMES OVER $5,000. (HM)

ED011135

OREGON SCHOOL STUDY COUNCIL

BULLETIN

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF INCONSISTENT VOTER BEHAVIOR IN SCHOOL BUDGET ELECTIONS

by

John Van Schoonhoven
and
Wade N. Patterson

Vol. 10, No. 5 November, 1966

OREGON SCHOOL STUDY COUNCIL
School of Education
University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon

EA 000 325

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF INCONSISTENT VOTER BEHAVIOR IN SCHOOL BUDGET ELECTIONS

by

John Van Schoonhoven

and

Wade N. Patterson

Individual Copy Price - $2.50

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the Problem	1
	Background of the Study	1
II.	THE SAMPLE AND SAMPLING PROCEDURE	3
III.	DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE VOTER SAMPLE	6
IV.	REASONS FOR INCONSISTENT VOTER BEHAVIOR	15
V.	CHARACTERISTICS OF POSITIVE VOTERS	19
VI.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	31
BIBLIOGRAPHY		33
APPENDICES		35

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Springfield Public School District #19 and David Douglas Public School District #40 are districts with similar student enrollment in Oregon which were both forced to undergo repeat elections before their operating budgets passed for 1964-65.

In each district, there were groups of voters who were registered, and did not vote in the initial election, but did vote during a repeat election in which the budget was passed.

It is this group of "inconsistent voters" that will be sampled in this study. Demographic characteristics will be correlated with voting behavior[1] to determine if significant characteristics are exhibited by persons in this category who supported the budget.

Background of the Study

In their book, American Voting Behavior, Burdick and Brodbeck[2] indicate the need for a new approach to study in this field. They believe the general or "shotgun approach" while appropriate to the initial study of voting behavior, has served its purpose. Accumulation of general research findings make it possible

> . . .for the future researcher to limit his research interests and build the design which would optimally serve those interests. This may mean a design concerned entirely with the study of small groups, or of issues, etc.[3]

---

[1]The data were collected by use of the questionnaire that is reproduced in Appendix B.

[2]Burdick, Eugene and Brodbeck, Arthur J. (Eds.), American Voting Behavior, Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press, 1959, p. 43.

[3]Ibid., p. 43.

One approach to this method is the use of factorial or stratified sampling. Burdick and Brodbeck define this as. . .

> Sampling plans in which the objective is to obtain specific types of individuals in given proportions without regard to their actual proportion in the total population under study.[1]

This study is a repeat effort to deal with such a factorial group, those members of the voting population which did not vote in what proved to be an unsuccessful school budget election, but did vote in the subsequent successful election.

These individuals may be considered as a segment of the voting population classified as inconsistent voters. Review of the literature of voting behavior does not reveal studies that are concerned with this portion of the voting population. Most studies of school elections deal with the degree of participation of voters, the characteristics of the voter and his attitudes, but only as a member of the total voting population. Studies of voters with specific voting or non-voting patterns were not found.

A pattern of voting behavior is investigated in this study, based upon the following questions. In regard to those registered voters that did not vote in a school budget election which proved to be unsuccessful, but did vote in the subsequent successful election:

1. What are the demographic characteristics of these voters?
2. Why did they vote as they did?
3. What reasons do they give for not voting and then voting?
4. Do those people voting in favor of the budget exhibit any significantly different characteristics from those voting in opposition to the budget?

---

[1] Burdick and Brodbeck, p. 45.

CHAPTER II

THE SAMPLE AND SAMPLING PROCEDURE

Springfield Public School District voters had passed school budgets in excess of the six per cent limitation for the past several years on the first presentation. The May 4, 1964 election was for a budget of $2,363,658.50 in excess of the six per cent limitation. Election returns revealed 1,430 "No" votes and 1,316 "Yes" votes. None of the 14 polling places reported negative results.

The David Douglas Public School District voters had also passed initial school budgets in excess of the limitation since the creation of the unified district many years ago. An April 1, 1964 election was held for a budget of $3,387,670. A total of 1,618 "No" votes and 1,301 "Yes" votes was counted. The same $3,387,670 budget was submitted to the voters again on May 2, 1964. It also lost, this time by only one vote, 2,432 "No" to 2,431 "Yes". Five of the 10 polling places reported positive results, three were negative, and two had tie votes.

The Springfield budget was reduced by $30,000 to $2,333,658.80 for the final June 8, 1964 election. The David Douglas budget was also reduced by $330,000 to $3,057,670 for the final June 3, 1964 election. The reduction in both districts was general in nature and did not eliminate specific parts of the school program that might have been a serious point of contention.

The final and winning vote in Springfield taken on June 8, 1964 showed 2,383 people voting "Yes" and 1,731 voting "No." Only three polling places reported negative results. The winning June 3, 1964 vote in the David Douglas School District showed 6,134 "Yes" votes and 1,551 "No" votes. All ten polling places reported positive results.

A total of 2,746 people voted in Springfield's first election and 4,114 voted in the second election. This increase of 1,368 voters cast 301 more negative votes and 1,067 affirmative votes. There is no means of determining if the increase of negative or positive votes is the result of changed votes or new votes. It seems logical to assume that both factors are instrumental in producing these figures. The margin of success in the second election was 652 votes, while the margin of defeat in the earlier election was 114 votes. From the total of 4,114 people voting in the successful second election, 1,666 had not voted in the original, losing election. The study centered on this group of Springfield voters, those that voted only in the last election.

David Douglas needed three attempts before its budget passed in 1964. The study focused only on the second losing election and the successful third election. In the second attempt, 4,863 persons voted and the third and final vote attracted 7,685 persons, an increase of 2,822. A decrease of 881 negative votes and an increase of 3,703 positive votes were cast. The overwhelming margin of success in the last election was 4,583 votes while the earlier margin of defeat in the second election was one vote. From the total of 7,685 people voting in the successful third David Douglas election, 2,330 had not voted in the second, losing election. This group, which voted only in the last election, was the focus for the voter behavior study.

The poll books for both Springfield elections and the second and third David Douglas elections were available in the respective school administration offices. A comparison of the two sets of poll books for each of the polling places, in each district, made possible the identification of persons voting only in the last, winning elections. Again, Springfield had 1,666 "inconsistent voters" by this definition, while David Douglas had 2,230.

The voters of both districts were ranked alphabetically by precinct within each poll book. That is, all the voters whose name began with the same letter were listed alphabetically.

Because the 1,666 Springfield voters who met the qualifications for the study were too large to study, a sample of this population was made. The study of David Douglas voters, as in every case, received the same treatment.

A stratified-fixed interval sample was obtained in each district. The sample was stratified in that it was taken from each poll book rather than from the total sample. It was determined that one in ten of the total population was adequate for the sample. The population was ranked within a poll book and an initial number selected at random. Thereafter, every tenth member of the population was selected as a member of the sample. This technique was repeated in each of the poll books. The result was a sample of 164 voters in Springfield and 230 voters from David Douglas. Their names and addresses were taken from the poll books for use in the collection of data for the study.

Questionnaires by mail were employed as the method of acquiring information (data) from the 10% sample in each district. The questionnaire contained 19 items. Twelve of the items were multiple choice questions and the remaining seven items were open-ended, requiring a completion answer. (See Appendix A).

The mimeographed questionnaire was mailed to each of the voters selected for the sample in both districts. A cover letter,indicating the nature of the study and requesting anonymous responses, was included.

There were 74 useable responses from Springfield and 96 from David Douglas. The 45% return from Springfield and 43% return from David Douglas was small, but it was considered representative of similar responses using one mailing.

A comparison can be made between the responses of the voters in both districts returning the questionnaires and the net increase of voters in the winning budget elections. Springfield has a 1,368 voter increase and David Douglas had a 2,822 increase in voters. In Springfield, a 57.9% affirmative over-all vote was noted and David Douglas had a 79.8% affirmative vote. The Springfield voters who returned the questionnaire cast a 71.6% affirmative vote. David Douglas study respondents were 83.3% affirmative in their vote.

CHAPTER III

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE VOTER SAMPLE

Information from the items on the questionnaire, which provided demographic information from each respondent in both districts was coded and punched onto IBM tabulating cards. The data cards were processed through the IBM 1620 computer using multi-variate contingency tabulations. A print-out of the number and percentage of responses for each category of each question was made. A reproduction of the comparative computation of Springfield and David Douglas data is found on the following pages. A discussion of pertinent findings will follow the numerical data.

Some of the items of the questionnaire have been repeated, with a regrouping of the responses. This type of grouping has been made only when the combinations were logical and the results helpful in analyzing the data.

Items numbered 17, 18, and 19 measured attitude rather than demographic data. These items will be discussed later in the study.

The tabulation of some of the items of the questionnaires in both districts do not add up to 100% because some responses to some items were missing.

The first item, sex, indicates that the Springfield "inconsistent" voter sample was made up of women in almost three-fifths of the instances. The David Douglas voters which were sampled, included women almost as frequently, (55.2%).

The second item, pertaining to age of the voters, showed an even distribution, except for a small group of over 65 age group, in the age groupings for Springfield. David Douglas had only one of 96 respondents in the over 65 age group along with a slightly less than 20% in the youngest, 21-35, age group. The middle age groups, 36-65, contained almost 80% of all "inconsistent" voters that were sampled.

Item three, head of household, shows that about 46% of the Springfield members of the sample were in this classification, compared to about 42% from David Douglas.

Item four, family status, indicates only about 5% single voters in Springfield and 3% for David Douglas.

Item five, schooling completed, shows that both Springfield's and David Douglas' largest group completed high school. Springfield's smallest group graduated from college and David Douglas' smallest group completed grade school only.

A comparison of the educational preparation of the respondents from both districts shows a higher level of educational preparation of the voters responding from the David Douglas district.

Item six, occupational classification, was a completion type question. A classification developed by Caplow[1] was the basis of the more elaborate classification. This was adjusted to more closely fit the responses received. The categories of "retired" and "housewife" were added to the classification, but were removed in either one or both of the collapsed (simplified) tables.

Housewives made up the largest number of all categories in both districts. White-collar workers in both districts were the largest single group in both districts. Springfield had fewest professionals and David Douglas had fewest unskilled manual workers of all categories in their respective districts.

Under item 6a, the table was simplified, providing for three categories. Housewives were eliminated from this grouping. Springfield had slightly more than half from the professional-small business-white-collar group and David Douglas had nearly three-fourths under the same breakdown.

Under item 6b, the retired people were removed, leaving a classification of workers including professional, small business-white-collar, and manual. Springfield had 60% and David Douglas had more than 70% in the professional-small business-white-collar group.

Generally all of the breakdowns of item 6 indicated a higher level of occupation, as developed by Caplow, for the respondent from the David Douglas district as compared to those from the Springfield district.

Item seven, occupation of spouse, shows housewives again as the largest group in both districts. In Springfield, the largest income-producing group was skilled manual workers and David Douglas had more white-collar income-producers than any other category

---

[1]Caplow, Theodore, The Sociology of Work, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1954, p. 36.

Items 7a and 7b show manual workers in the majority in Springfield. Professional-small business-white-collar is the majority classification for both items in the David Douglas School District.

Item eight, total family income, is above $5,000 for most persons in Springfield. Family income in the David Douglas district is, in most cases, above $7,000. Springfield's median salary, based upon the five classifications, is between $5,000 and $6,999. The David Douglas median is more than $9,000. This would support the higher level of education and occupation found in this district.

Item nine, children in district's public schools, indicates that in both districts, two out of every five voters had no children attending the public schools. Of the other categories, three children in school was the most prevalent in Springfield and one child was most prevalent for David Douglas.

Item 10, neighborhood, showed that a large majority of the sample population lived in residential areas as compared to rural areas in both districts.

Item 11, paying property taxes, showed an affirmative response from most of the people in each district.

Item 12, residence in district, showed that approximately two-thirds of the sample population had lived in Springfield over ten years. David Douglas had somewhat less than half in this category. Less than two-year residents were almost non-existent in both districts.

Item 13, political position, indicated about 70% Democrats in Springfield compared with about 50% in David Douglas. Springfield had only about 5% Independents while David Douglas had 13.5%.

Item 14, church preference, showed about four of five persons to be Protestants in Springfield and about three and one-half of five the same at David Douglas.

Item 14a, Protestant church preference, indicated a substantial group of Methodists of the many denominations in Springfield. David Douglas also had many groups mentioned with Lutherans and Episcopalians having a slight edge in size over other Protestant church "members."

In developing satisfactory categories for organizational membership, a scale developed by Warner[1] was helpful. The scale was revised as responses to the questions were tabulated.

---

[1]Warner, W. Lloyd, Social Class in America, New York, Harper and Row, Publishers, 1960.

Item 15, most important organization, focuses on the church for about 40% of Springfield's respondents and about 25% of David Douglas' respondents. Springfield had 23% with no response or indicating they did not belong to an organization and David Douglas had about 35% in this category.

Item 16, voting record, shows that 71.6% of the Springfield sample voted in favor of the budget. Of the over-all voters throughout the district, the affirmative vote was 57.9%. The sample from David Douglas voted 83.3% positive compared to an over-all district-wide positive vote of 79.8%.

COMPARATIVE DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

OF THE VOTING SAMPLE IN TWO DISTRICTS

Item	Springfield		David Douglas	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
1. Sex:				
Male	30	40.5	43	44.8
Female	44	59.5	53	55.2
	74	100.0	96	100.0
2. Age:				
21-35	21	28.4	19	19.8
36-45	21	28.4	38	39.6
45-65	21	28.4	37	38.5
Over 65	11	14.9	1	1.0
	74	100.0	96	98.9
3. Head of Household:				
Yes	34	45.9	41	41.7
No	40	54.1	55	56.3
	74	100.0	96	98.0
4. Family Status:				
Single	4	5.4	4	3.1
Married	70	94.6	92	93.8
	74	100.0	96	96.9
5. Schooling Completed:				
Grade School only	7	9.5	3	3.1
Some High School	13	17.6	9	9.4
High School graduate	29	39.2	42	43.8
Some college	19	25.7	23	24.0
College graduate	5	6.8	17	17.7
	74	100.0	94	98.0

Item	Springfield Number	Springfield Per Cent	David Douglas Number	David Douglas Per Cent
6. Occupation:				
Professional	2	2.7	11	11.5
Small business	4	5.4	4	4.2
White collar	13	24.3	25	26.0
Skilled manual	3	4.1	5	5.2
Semi-skilled manual	7	9.5	7	7.3
Un-skilled manual	6	8.1	3	3.1
Retired	6	8.1	1	1.0
Housewives	28	37.8	39	40.6
	74	100.0	95	99.0
6a. Occupation:				
Professional-small business white-collar	24	52.2	40	71.4
Manual workers	16	34.8	15	26.8
Retired	6	13.0	1	1.8
	46	100.0	56	100.0
6b. Occupation:				
Professional-small business white-collar	24	60.0	40	72.7
Manual worker	16	40.0	15	27.3
	40	100.0	55	100.0
7. Occupation of spouse:				
Deceased or none	5	6.8	0	0.0
Professional	5	6.8	5	5.2
Small business	4	5.4	4	4.2
White collar	5	6.8	23	24.0
Skilled manual	18	24.3	11	11.5
Semi-skilled manual	5	6.8	12	12.5
Unskilled manual	5	6.8	3	3.1
Retired	5	6.8	3	3.1
Housewife	22	29.7	27	28.1
	74	100.0	93	95.8

Item	Springfield Number	Springfield Per Cent	David Douglas Number	David Douglas Per Cent
7a. Occupation of Spouse:				
Professional-small business				
white-collar	14	29.8	32	49.2
Manual workers	28	59.6	30	46.1
Retired	5	10.6	3	4.7
	47	100.0	65	100.0
7b. Occupation of Spouse:				
Professional-small business				
white-collar	14	33.3	32	51.7
Manual workers	28	66.7	30	48.3
	42	100.0	62	100.0
8. Total family income:				
Less than $3,000	5	6.8	3	3.1
$3,000 to $4,999	8	10.8	4	4.2
$5,000 to $6,999	22	29.7	18	18.8
$7,000 to $8,999	15	20.3	22	22.9
$9,000 or more	20	27.0	48	50.0
	70	94.6	95	98.0
9. Children in district's public schools:				
No children	31	41.9	41	42.7
One child	11	14.9	23	24.0
Two children	13	17.6	16	16.7
Three children	15	20.3	11	11.5
Four or more children	3	4.1	4	4.2
	73	98.8	95	98.9
10. Neighborhood:				
Residential	64	86.5	91	94.8
Rural	10	13.5	3	3.1
	74	100.0	94	97.9

Item	Springfield Number	Springfield Per Cent	David Douglas Number	David Douglas Per Cent
11. Paying property taxes:				
Yes	69	93.2	89	92.7
No	5	6.8	5	5.2
	74	100.0	94	97.9
12. Residence in district:				
Less than 2 years	2	2.7	1	1.0
2 to 5 years	14	18.9	17	17.7
5 to 10 years	9	12.2	33	34.4
More than 10 years	49	66.2	44	45.8
	74	100.0	95	98.9
13. Political position:				
Democrat	52	70.3	47	49.0
Republican	17	23.0	33	34.4
Independent	4	5.4	13	13.5
	73	98.7	93	96.9
14. Church preference:				
Methodist	15	29.4	3	3.1
Baptist	9	17.6	9	9.4
Christian	5	9.8	8	8.3
Latter Day Saints	5	9.8	3	3.1
Presbyterian	4	7.8	4	4.2
Lutheran	3	5.9	11	11.5
Episcopal	2	3.9	13	13.5
Assembly of God	2	3.9	0	0.0
Miscellaneous	6	11.5	6	6.3
	51	100.0	57	59.4

Item	Springfield Number	Springfield Per Cent	David Douglas Number	David Douglas Per Cent
15. Most important organization:				
No response	10	13.5	26	27.1
Social	1	1.4	3	3.1
Civic	4	5.4	4	4.2
Church	30	40.5	24	25.0
Secret Society	7	9.5	6	6.3
Home	2	2.7	1	1.0
Occupational	6	8.1	14	14.6
Youth Oriented	6	8.1	10	10.4
None	7	9.5	8	8.3
	74	100.0	96	100.0
16. Voting record:				
In favor of the budget	53	71.6	80	83.3
Opposed to the budget	21	28.4	14	14.6
	74	100.0	94	97.9

CHAPTER IV

REASONS FOR INCONSISTENT VOTER BEHAVIOR

Item 17 attempts to answer why the voters in the sample voted as they did. The classification of responses to item 17 was based entirely upon the remarks of the members of the sample population. It was often necessary to interpret the intended meaning from the remarks based upon implication and the nature of previous remarks. The classifications and the frequency and the percentage of the responses are given below.

Why did you vote as you did?

	Springfield		David Douglas	
Classification	Number	Per Cent of Vote	Number	Per Cent of Vote
Needed or recognized the value of education	44	59.5	56	58.3
Good use of district funds	3	4.1	16	16.7
Taxes too high	10	13.5	3	3.1
Poor use of district funds	10	13.5	11	11.5
Miscellaneous	3	4.1	10	10.5
	70	100.0	90	100.0

As the chart shows, the majority of the sample population in both districts recognized the need or the value of education. Why these persons did recognize the need or value enough to vote in the previous, losing election is not known. The majority of the people opposing the budget indicated that taxes were too high or the district was using funds for purposes the voter did not approve.

Item 18 of the questionnaire gives the response which attempts to determine the reason the voter failed to vote in the first election. The classification chart is shown on the following page.

Why didn't you vote in the May 4, defeated budget election?

Classification	Springfield		David Douglas	
	Number	Per Cent of Vote	Number	Per Cent of Vote
Out of town	19	25.7	18	18.8
Illness or otherwise unable	24	32.4	22	22.9
Unaware	17	23.0	19	19.8
Angry or confused	3	4.1	7	7.3
Thought they voted	5	6.8	2	2.1
Didn't remember	1	1.4	6	6.3
Apathetic	0	0.0	18	18.8
	69	91.4	92	95.8

As the chart indicates, about 58% of the Springfield voters and about 42% of the David Douglas respondents indicated they were unable, in some way, to vote in the previous election. If this can be assumed to be valid, then the Springfield 24% and the David Douglas 26% that simply forgot or were unaware of the election might be the most easily reached by added publicity of the school budget election. The voters in each district that were angry or confused, or thought they voted were in a small minority.

Item 19 provided information designed to answer the last major question asked in this study.

Why did you vote in the June 11, successful budget election?

Classification	Springfield		David Douglas	
	Number	Per Cent of Vote	Number	Per Cent of Vote
For passage of the budget	23	31.1	54	56.3
To defeat the budget	12	16.2	11	11.5
Duty and privilege	23	31.1	12	12.5
Available	7	9.5	6	6.3
Outside influences	5	6.8	8	8.3
	70	94.7	91	94.8

As the chart indicates, most of the responses were flat statements which expressed the way the individuals voted rather than their reasons for voting. In the remaining categories, implications appear to be many and varied.

The majority of people seemed to feel they had a legitimate reason for not voting in the previous election. On the last vote, however, they seemed very determined to utilize their vote, either in favor of or in opposition to the budget. They appeared to want to make sure their opinion was felt in the final election results.

REASONS FOR INCONSISTENT

VOTER BEHAVIOR

Classification	Springfield Number	Springfield Per Cent of Vote	David Douglas Number	David Douglas Per Cent of Vote
17. Why did you vote as you did?:				
Needed or recognized the value of education	44	59.5	56	58.3
Good use of district funds	3	4.1	16	16.7
Taxes too high	10	13.5	3	3.1
Poor use of district funds	10	13.5	11	11.5
Miscellaneous	3	4.1	10	10.5
	70	100.0	90	100.0
18. Why didn't you vote in the May 4, defeated budget election?:				
Out of town	19	25.7	18	18.8
Illness or otherwise unable	24	32.4	22	22.9
Unaware	17	23.0	19	19.8
Angry or confused	3	4.1	7	7.3
Thought they voted	5	6.8	2	2.1
Didn't remember	1	1.4	6	6.3
Apathetic	0	0.0	18	18.8
	69	91.4	92	95.8
19. Why did you vote in the June 11, successful budget election?:				
For passage of budget	23	31.1	54	56.3
To defeat budget	12	16.2	11	11.5
Duty and privilege	23	31.1	12	12.5
Available	7	9.5	6	6.3
Outside influences	5	6.8	8	8.3
	70	94.7	91	94.8

CHAPTER V

CHARACTERISTICS OF POSITIVE VOTERS

Items one through fifteen and item eighteen of the questionnaire were placed in comparison to the response to item sixteen, the response indicating if the members of the sample voted in favor or in opposition to the last, winning budget in both districts.

1. The null hypothesis was stated for each comparison:

   H_0 There is no significant difference between the response of the voters [on each question] and the way in which they voted.

2. The statistical test used was the Chi square test for two independent samples.

This test was selected as the instrument to measure the significance because the two groups are independent and the frequency of the responses can be classified in discrete categories.

Multivariate Contingency tabulations were used, employing the IBM 1620 calculator.

3. The .05 level of significance was used in each test of significance since the sensitivity of the comparisons were similar. The .05 level was deemed appropriate for comparisons of this nature.

The N of the Springfield sample was 74, although some collapsed cells were calculated with smaller N's. The N of the David Douglas sample was 96, although some collapsed cells were calculated with smaller N's.

A review of the chi-square tabulations shows a significant difference between the dependent and independent variables seven times for Springfield and just once for David Douglas. For Springfield, the items showing significant differences are: schooling completed (5); occupation (6a); occupation of spouse (7); income (8, 8a); and number of children in school (9, 9a). The significant difference in the David Douglas sample was number of children in school (9a).

There appeared to be no correlation at all in either district between the sex of the respondents and the way they voted.

Although no statistical significance was noted in either district with respect to age and positive voting, the positive Springfield voters tended to be somewhat younger than those over 45 years of age. No observation of this type was at all apparent in the David Douglas School District.

No correlation between being head of the household and positive or negative voting was noted in either district.

No correlation between marital status and positive or negative voting was noted in either district.

In Springfield, there was a significant difference between voting in favor of the budget and schooling completed. Persons in the category of some college preparation supported the budget more than any other group. College graduates gave less support to the budget than any other group, but the N of this Springfield group was small and had little effect on the statistical results. The three middle categories of: some high school; high school graduates; and some college contained an N of 61 to make up the influential basis of the comparison. Although David Douglas' voters showed no statistical significance there was some tendency for persons with more schooling to support the budget (5).

Although no statistical significance was noted in either district with respect to occupations requiring relatively more skill or responsibility and positive voting, some tendency existed in this direction among Springfield voters. There was no evidence of any tendency in this direction among David Douglas voters (6a).

The collapsed table for Springfield which classified occupations as: professional-small business-white-collar; manual workers; and retired people was significantly different when compared with support of the budget. Inspection shows that the significance in this comparison lies between the income-producers and the retired people. Wage earners supported the budget more often than did retired people. The David Douglas voters displayed no indications of this type. A comparison between manual workers and other income-producers (6b) indicated no correlation in either district.

In Springfield, the occupation of the spouse as classified in the initial categories for occupations, when compared with support of the budget, was significant. Inspection of this comparison shows the major difference is between the income-producers and the non-producers. Respondents who were income-producers, with the exception of the semi-skilled manual workers, supported the school budget more often than the housewives. There was no tendency in this direction among the David Douglas voters (7).

For Springfield, a chi-square comparing income-producers with housewives fell slightly short of being significant, probably because of the semi-skilled wage earners exception to supporting the budget. This tendency did not appear again in the David Douglas School District (7a).

The Springfield families with larger incomes voted more often in favor of the budget than did families with smaller incomes (8). While this was significant, there were slight deviations from the general trend at the lower and upper end of the income scale. The percentage of difference from the trend was small and this did not alter the significance or the implications of this comparison. David Douglas voters again showed no tendency in this direction.

Collapsing the cells of this questionnaire item to provide a comparison (8a) between support of the budget and those voters earning more and less than $5,000 per year, proved to be significant for Springfield but not for David Douglas.

Questionnaire item nine, the increasing number of children in school, provided a significant relationship when compared with support of the Springfield school budget. People with no children in the Springfield Public Schools supported the budget less than persons with children in school. This support increased with the number of children in school. Although no statistical significance was noted among David Douglas voters, there was some tendency in this same direction.

A significant comparison in both districts was noted between budget support and persons with children in school as compared with voters with no children in school (9a).

No significance was noted in either district among positive voters living in a residential area as compared with a rural area (10).

No significance was noted in either district among positive voters not paying property taxes as compared with those who did pay property taxes (11).

There was no significance in either district between positive voters who had longer, as compared with shorter, terms of residence in their school districts (12).

No significance was found in either district between positive voters and their political position (13), or their church preferences (14). This also held true for positive voters compared with preference for different Protestant church denominations in both districts (14a).

A comparison between positive voters and selection of organizations they consider most important yielded no significance in either district (15).

There was no significance between voters and their reasons given for not voting in the previous, unsuccessful election compared with the way in which they voted in the last, successful election in either district.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF VOTING POSITION AND VOTER CHARACTERISTICS

1. H_1 - There is a significant difference between the sex of the sample and the way they vote.

	Springfield		David Douglas	
	Number	% Voting Yes	Number	% Voting Yes
What is your sex?:				
Male	30	66.3	43	83.7
Female	44	77.3	52	84.6

X^2 Needed = 3.84 Sp X^2 = 1.703 DD X^2 = 0.043

No significant difference in either district.

2. H_1 - A greater portion of the respondents who are young will vote in favor of the budget election than will the older respondents.

What is your age?:				
21-35	21	76.2	19	94.7
36-45	21	81.0	38	81.6
46-65	21	66.7	37	81.1
Over 65	11	54.5	1	100.0

X^2 Needed = 3.91 (One-tailed test)

Sp X^2 = 2.420 DD X^2 = 1.368 No significant difference in either district.

2a. H_1 - A greater portion of the respondents who are under 45 years of age will vote in favor of the budget election than will the respondents over 45 years of age.

What is your age?:				
Under 45	42	75.0	57	90.9
Over 45	33	62.5	38	83.8

X^2 Needed = 1.92 (One-tailed test)

Sp X^2 = 1.585 DD X^2 = .000 No significant difference in either district.

	Springfield		David Douglas	
	Number	% Voting Yes	Number	% Voting Yes

3. H_1 - There is a significant difference between being or not being head of the household and voting for or against the budget election.

Are you head of the household?:

Yes	34	67.6	41	80.0
No	40	75.0	55	87.0

X^2 Needed = 3.84 (Two-tailed test)

Sp X^2 = .488 DD X^2 = 0.482 No significant difference in either district.

4. H_1 - There is a significant difference between family status and the voting in favor or in opposition to the budget by the members of the sample.

What is your family status?:

Single	4	100.0	3	66.7
Married	74	70.0	89	84.4

X^2 Needed = 3.84 (Two-tailed test)

Sp X^2 = .585 DD X^2 = 0.018 No significant difference in either district.

5. H_1 - A significantly greater number of the respondents with a small amount of education will vote in opposition to the budget election than will the respondents with more education.

How much schooling have you completed?:

Grade school only	7	71.4	3	100.0
Some high school	13	46.2	9	77.8
High school grad.	29	75.9	42	76.2
Some college	19	89.5	23	95.7
College grad.	5	40.0	17	88.2

X^2 Needed = 4.75 (One-tailed test)

Sp X^2 = 7.692 DD X^2 = 3.120 Significant difference in Springfield. No significant difference in David Douglas.

	Springfield		David Douglas	
	Number	% Voting Yes	Number	% Voting Yes

6. H_1 - Those members of the sample whose occupation requires more skill or responsibility will vote in favor of the budget significantly more than will those members employing less skill or responsibility in their occupation.

What is your occupation?:

Professional	2	0.0	11	100.0
Small business	4	75.0	4	75.0
White collar wkr	18	88.9	24	80.0
Skilled manual wkr	3	66.7	5	80.0
Semi-skilled manual worker	7	57.1	7	85.7
Unskilled manual worker	6	83.3	3	66.7
Retired	6	50.0	1	100.0
Housewife	28	71.4	39	84.6

X^2 Needed = 7.75 (One-tailed test)

Sp X^2 = 5.666 DD X^2 = 1.402 No significant difference in either district.

6a. H_1 - Those members of the sample whose occupation is professional, managerial or white collar work will vote favorable to the budget significantly more often than will manual laborers and they in turn will vote more favorable to the budget than the retired members of the sample.

What is your occupation?:

Professional-small business-white collar wkrs	24	79.2	39	91.3
Manual workers	16	68.8	15	80.0
Retired	6	50.0	1	100.0

X^2 Needed = 3.00 (One-tailed test)

Sp X^2 = 4.96 DD X^2 = .555 Significant difference in Springfield. No significant difference in David Douglas.

	Springfield		David Douglas	
	Number	% Voting Yes	Number	% Voting Yes

6b. H_1 - Those members of the sample whose occupation is professional, managerial, or white collar work will vote favorable to the budget significantly more often than will manual laborers.

What is your occupation?:

Professional-small business-white collar wkrs	24	79.2	39	91.3
Manual workers	16	68.8	15	80.0

X^2 Needed = 1.92 (One-tailed test)

Sp X^2 = .217 DD X^2 = .004 No significant difference in either district.

7. H_1 - A significantly greater portion of the spouses of the respondents engaged in professional, managerial and white collar work than those engaged in manual work, and a greater portion of those engaged in manual work than retired will vote in favor of the budget.

What is the occupation of your spouse?:

Deceased or none	5	100.0	0	0.0
Professional	5	100.0	5	100.0
Small business	4	100.0	4	100.0
White collar wkr	5	80.0	23	87.0
Skilled manual wkr	18	88.9	11	81.8
Semi-skilled manual worker	5	40.0	12	83.3
Unskilled manual wkr	5	80.0	7	85.7
Retired	5	0.0	3	100.0
Housewives	22	59.1	26	77.8

X^2 Needed = 7.75 (One-tailed test)

Sp X^2 = 16.978 DD X^2 = .533 Significant difference in Springfield. No significant difference in David Douglas.

	Springfield		David Douglas	
	Number	% Voting Yes	Number	% Voting Yes

7a. H_1 - There will be a significant difference between the way income-producing people and housewives vote on the budget election.

What is the occupation of your spouse?:

Income producers	42	83.3	66	81.8
Housewives	22	59.1	26	80.8

X^2 Needed = 3.84 (Two-tailed test)

Sp X^2 = 3.490 DD X^2 = .132 No significant difference in either district.

8. H_1 - Respondents with higher incomes will vote more favorable to the budget than those with low incomes.

What is the total family income before deductions?:

Less than $3,000	5	40.0	3	100.0
$3,000-$4,999	8	37.5	4	75.0
$5,000-$6,999	22	72.7	17	77.8
$7,000-$8,999	15	86.7	22	81.8
$9,000 or more	20	85.0	48	87.5

X^2 Needed = 4.75 (One-tailed test)

Sp X^2 = 7.896 DD X^2 = 0.874 Significant difference in Springfield. No significant difference in David Douglas.

8a. H_1 - Respondents with incomes over $5,000 will vote more favorable to the budget than will those people with incomes of less than $5,000.

What is the total family income before deductions?:

Under $5,000	13	38.5	7	85.7
Over $5,000	57	80.7	87	85.1

X^2 Needed = 1.92 (One-tailed test)

Sp X^2 = 7.534 DD X^2 = .255 Significant difference in Springfield. No significant difference in David Douglas.

	Springfield		David Douglas	
	Number	% Voting Yes	Number	% Voting Yes

9. H_1 - Respondents with more children in school will vote significantly more often in favor of the budget than those people with fewer children in school or no children in school.

How many children do you have attending public schools?:

No children	31	58.1	40	75.6
One child	11	72.7	23	87.0
Two children	13	84.6	16	93.8
Three children	15	86.7	11	90.9
4 or more children	3	100.0	4	100.0

X^2 Needed = 4.75 (One-tailed test)

Sp X^2 = 5.097 DD X^2 = 2.415 Significant difference in Springfield. No significant difference in David Douglas.

9a. H_1 - Respondents with children in school will vote more favorable to the budget than those with no children in school.

How many children do you have attending the public schools?:

No children	31	58.1	40	77.5
Children in school	42	83.3	54	90.7

X^2 Needed = 1.92 (One-tailed test)

Sp X^2 = 4.510 DD X^2 = 2.996 Significant difference in both districts.

10. H_1 - There will be a significant difference between living in a residential or rural area and the way in which the respondents vote.

Where do you live?:

In a residential area	64	68.8	90	83.5
In a rural area	10	90.0	3	100.0

X^2 Needed = 3.84 (Two-tailed test)

Sp X^2 = 1.358 DD X^2 = 0.029 No significant difference in either district.

	Springfield		David Douglas	
	Number	% Voting Yes	Number	% Voting Yes

11. H_1 - Those voters sampled who pay property taxes in the school districts will vote less favorably on the budget than will those who do not pay these taxes.

Do you pay taxes upon property within the school district?:

Yes	69	69.6	88	84.3
No	5	100.0	5	80.0

X^2 Needed = 1.92 (One-tailed test)

Sp X^2 = .973 DD X^2 = 0.00 No significant difference in either district.

12. H_1 - There will be a significant difference between the length of time the respondents have lived in the school district and the way they vote.

How long have you lived in the school district?:

Less than 2 yrs	2	50.0	1	100.0
2-5 years	14	71.4	17	82.4
5-10 years	9	88.9	33	93.9
More than 10 yrs	49	69.4	43	77.3

X^2 Needed = 7.82 (Two-tailed test)

Sp X^2 = .927 DD X^2 = 2.759 No significant difference in either district.

13. H_1 - There will be a significant difference between the political position of the voters and the way in which they vote.

What is your political position?:

Democrat	52	75.0	47	85.1
Republican	17	58.5	33	84.8
Independent	4	75.0	13	84.6

X^2 Needed = 5.99 (Two-tailed test)

Sp X^2 = 1.260 DD X^2 = 0.00 No significant differences in either district.

	Springfield		David Douglas	
	Number	% Voting Yes	Number	% Voting Yes

14. H_1 - There will be a significant difference between the church preference of the voters and the way in which they vote.

What is your church preference?:

Catholic	9	55.6	3	67.6
Protestant	61	73.8	68	81.8
No religion	1	100.0	25	80.0

X^2 Needed = 5.99 (Two-tailed test)

Sp X^2 = .814 DD X^2 = .0646 No significant difference in either district.

14a. H_1 - There will be a significant difference between preference for different Protestant church denominations by the voters and the way in which they vote.

What is your church preference?:

Methodist	15	66.7	3	100.0
Baptist	9	88.9	9	88.9
Christian	5	80.0	8	87.5
Latter Day Saints	5	100.0	3	100.0
Presbyterian	4	75.0	4	100.0
Lutheran	3	66.7	11	63.6
Episcopal	2	0.0	13	84.6
Assembly of God	2	50.0	0	0.0
Others	6	83.3	6	83.3

X^2 Needed = 15.51 (Two-tailed test)

Sp X^2 = 4.053 DD X^2 = 5.247 No significant difference in either district.

	Springfield		David Douglas	
	Number	% Voting Yes	Number	% Voting Yes

15. H_1 - There will be a significant difference between the voters selection of organizations they consider most important and the way in which they vote.

What is the most important organization to which you belong?:

No response	10	50.0	24	80.8
Social	1	100.0	3	100.0
Civic	4	100.0	4	75.0
Church	30	66.7	24	95.8
Secret society	7	57.1	6	50.0
Home	2	50.0	1	0.0
Occupational	6	83.3	14	85.7
Youth oriented	6	100.0	10	80.0
No organization	7	85.7	8	87.5

X^2 Needed = 14.07 (Two-tailed test)

Sp X^2 = 3.088 DD X^2 = 6.071 No significant difference in either district.

18. H_1 - The reasons given for not voting in the first election and the way in which they voted in the second election are significantly different.

Why didn't you vote in the defeated budget election?:

Out of town	19	73.7	18	75.0
Illness or otherwise unable	24	66.7	22	100.0
Forgot or unaware	17	76.5	19	91.7
Angry or confused	3	100.0	7	66.7
Thought they voted	5	40.0	2	87.5
Didn't remember	1	100.0	6	0.0
Apathy	1	---	7	100.0

X^2 Needed = 11.07 (Two-tailed test)

Sp X^2 = 1.707 DD X^2 = 6.234 No significant difference in either district.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A study of a sample of "inconsistent voters," who had not voted in a previous, unsuccessful school budget election, but who had voted in the subsequent, successful election was made in Springfield and David Douglas Public School Districts in Oregon. These voters answered mail questionnaires which called for: demographic characteristics; reasons for voting like they did; reasons for not voting originally and then voting later; and characteristics which may be linked with positive or negative voting.

Machine data processing of all questionnaire items indicated that the demographic characteristics of voter respondents in Springfield were different in several ways than those from the David Douglas District. The level of schooling completed was considerably higher in the David Douglas District along with many more professional and fewer manual occupations. A much larger percentage of David Douglas spouses were in the white collar worker category and fewer retired spouses were noted.

Total income among David Douglas families was considerably higher than among Springfield families. Springfield had more rural residents and more persons who had lived in the district more than 10 years. There were many more Democrats in Springfield compared with larger David Douglas representation in the Republican and Independent ranks. Fewer Catholics and many more persons with no religious preference were found in the David Douglas District.

David Douglas respondents supported the last, successful school budget 83.3% and Springfield respondents were 71.6% in favor of the last, successful budget.

Reasons for voting as they did were similar for both districts. Approximately three-fifths of all persons felt their support was needed or they recognized the value of education. More persons felt that good use of funds was made in the David Douglas District and more Springfield voters felt taxes were too high. Failure to vote in the previous election was attributed to forgetting or being unaware among one quarter of each district's respondent population. More Springfield positive voters voted in the last, winning election because they felt their balloting was a duty or a privilege than did those from David Douglas. A majority in both districts felt they had a legitimate reason for not voting previously and they seemed very determined to utilize their vote to effect the outcome of the final budget election.

Statistically significant differences between positive voting and having children in school was noted in both districts. A tendency was noted for positive voters in both districts to have completed relatively more

years of schooling in both districts. An increasing tendency to vote positively was noted among people with larger numbers of children in both district's schools.

Differences between Springfield and David Douglas voters were noted on seven questionnaire items. Although not statistically significant, a tendency between positive voting and more occupational skill or responsibility was noted in Springfield but not in David Douglas. Again, a tendency (no statistical significance) appeared in Springfield for positive voters to be under 45 years of age.

Persons with spouses who were income-producers in Springfield significantly supported the budget as compared to spouses who were retired persons. This statistical significance was also true of Springfield spouses who were income-producers as compared with non-producers. This tendency also appeared among income-producers as compared to housewives among spouses. Springfield families with relatively larger incomes voted significantly more in favor of the budget than did smaller income families. Significance between positive voters with family incomes above $5,000 compared with those below $5,000 was apparent only in Springfield again.

This study indicates that there are relationships between the way the sample populations voted (positively) in the school budget elections and having children in school, having larger numbers of children in school, and the amount of schooling completed by the voter.

Some contradictory findings are noted between the two districts in the following areas where Springfield indicates definite tendencies and David Douglas does not: relatively more occupational skill or responsibility; under 45 years of age; persons with spouses as income-producers; relatively larger family incomes; and family incomes above $5,000.

Some of these contradictory findings where David Douglas does not appear to possess similar characteristics might be negated or explained by that district's larger percentage of positive voters, more homogenity of demographic characteristics, and higher incomes in all brackets.

Further implications and generalizations will be left for the reader to draw from the data and their treatment in the study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Backstrom, Charles H., Gerald D. Hursh, Survey Research, Northwestern University Press, 1963.

Berelson, Bernard R., Paul F. Lazarsfeld and William M. McPhee, Voting, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Boskoff, Alvin, Harmon Zeigler, Voting Patterns in a Local Election, Philadelphia, J.B. Lippincott Co., 1964.

Bradfield, James M., H. Stewart Moredock, Measurements and Evaluation in Education, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1957.

Burdick, Eugene and Arthur J. Brodbeck (Eds.), American Voting Behavior, Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press, 1959.

Bush, Chilton R. and Paul J. Deutschmann, The Interrelationships of Attitudes Toward Schools and Voting Behavior in a School Bond Election, Stanford, California, Pacific Southwest C.P.E.A., Stanford University, August, 1955.

Cahill, Robert S. and Stephen P. Hencley, The Politics of Education in the Local Community, Danville, Illinois, The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1964.

Campbell, Angus, Phillip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes, The American Voter, New York, John Wiley and Son, Inc., 1960.

Caplow, Theodore, The Sociology of Work, McGraw Hill Book Company, New York, 1954, p. 36.

Carter, Richard F. and John Sutthoff, Communities and Their Schools, A Technical Report from the School of Education, Stanford, California, Stanford University, December, 1960.

Garrett, Henry E., R.S. Woodworth, Statistics in Psychology and Education, New York, Longmans, Green and Co., 1958.

Parnell, Dale P., "Voter Participation Patterns in Three Oregon School Districts," (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oregon), December, 1964.

Powell, James H., Special School Tax Elections - Some Kentucky Experiences, Lexington, Kentucky, Bureau of School Service, University of Kentucky, March 1, 1964.

Rossi, Peter H., Trends in Voting Behavior Research: 1933-1963, Chicago, Illinois, National Opinion Research Center, September, 1963.

Rummell, J. Francis, An Introduction to Research Prodedures in Education, New York, Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1958.

Tope, Donald E. (Ed.), A Forward Look - The Preparation of School Administrators 1970, Eugene, Oregon, Bureau of Educational Research, University of Oregon, 1960.

Warner, W. Lloyd, Social Class in America, New York, Harper and Row, Publishers, 1960.

Whitney, Fredrick Lamson, The Elements of Research, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1956.

APPENDIX A: INTRODUCTORY LETTER SENT TO RESPONDENTS

December 31, 1965

I am conducting a study of public school elections. Your name has been selected by a sampling technique from among those registered voters that did not vote in the May 4, 1964 David Douglas Public Schools budget election which was defeated, but did vote in the successful June 11, 1964 election. I am interested in getting some of your ideas about these elections.

The enclosed questionnaire will take about fifteen minutes to complete. Please return it in the envelope provided. Do not identify yourself.

David Douglas Public School officials are not involved in this study in any way, although they have been made aware of the study.

Your assistance in completing the questionnaire and returning it promptly will be greatly appreciated.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

Wade Patterson

APPENDIX B: QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO RESPONDENTS

Please answer the following questionnaire by circling the number beside the best possible answer to that question. Write a brief answer to the questions with a blank space. Please do not sign your name.

1. What is your sex?:

   1) Male 2) Female

2. What is your age?:

   1) 21-35 3) 46-45

   2) 36-45 4) Over 65

3. Are you the head of the household?:

   1) Yes 2) No

4. What is your marital status?:

   1) Single 2) Married

5. How much schooling have you completed?:

   1) Grade school only 4) Some college

   2) Some high school 5) College graduate

   3) High school graduate

6. What is your occupation?:_____

7. What is the occupation of your spouse?:_____

8. What is your total family income before deductions?:

   1) Less than $3,000 4) $7,000 to $8,999

   2) $3,000 to $4,999 5) $9,000 or more

   3) $5,000 to $6,999

9. How many children do you have attending the David Douglas Public Schools?:

   1) No children 3) Two children 5) Four or more children

   2) One child 4) Three children

10. Where do you live?:

    1) In a residential area 2) In a rural area

11. Do you pay property taxes within the David Douglas School District?:

    1) Yes 2) No

12. How long have you lived in the David Douglas School District?:

    1) Less than 2 years 3) 5 to 10 years

    2) 2 to 5 years 4) More than 10 years

13. What is your political position?:

    1) Democrat 3) Independent

    2) Republican

14. What is your church preference?:_____

15. What is the most important organization to which you belong?:_____

16. How did you vote on the June 11, 1964 David Douglas Public School budget election?:

    1) In favor of the budget 2) Opposed to the budget

17. Why did you vote as you did?:_____

18. Why didn't you vote in the May 4, 1964 defeated budget election?:

19. Why did you vote in the June 11, 1964 successful budget election?: